Vote No. 439

September 18, 1995, 6:22 p.m. Page S-13717 Temp. Record

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS/Cotton Producer Disaster Assistance

SUBJECT:

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996...H.R. 1976. Cochran motion to table the Daschle (for Kerrey/Kohl) amendment No. 2686 to the committee amendment beginning on page 83, line 4.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE FAILED, 37-53

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide \$63.78 billion in new budget authority, 80 percent of which will be for mandatory spending programs, and 63 percent of which will be for food welfare programs.

The committee amendment beginning on page 83, line 4, would prohibit funding for implementing or enforcing the regulation promulgated by the Food Safety and Inspection Service on August 25, 1995 on poultry labeling, or for developing compliance guidelines for that regulation. (That regulation will only allow a "fresh" label to appear on those poultry products that have not been chilled below 26 degrees Fahrenheit.) The committee amendment would only allow this regulation to take effect if enacted into law, and would only allow a revised version to take effect if approved by the Agriculture Committees of Congress.

The Daschle (for Kerrey/Kohl) amendment would strike the authority given to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to provide \$41 million in disaster assistance to cotton producers.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Cochran moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: Following the failure of the motion to table, the amendment was adopted by voice vote.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The cotton fields of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Texas, Tennessee, and Arkansas have been decimated this year by massive infestations of tobacco bud worms, beet army worms, and other pests. Mississippi alone has suffered more than \$100

(See other side) **YEAS (37)** NAYS (53) NOT VOTING (10) Republicans **Democrats** Republicans Democrats Republicans **Democrats** (28 or 57%) (21 or 43%) (9 or 22%) (32 or 78%) **(5)** (5) D'Amato-2 Daschle-2 Abraham Akaka Coats Baucus Kennedy Domenici-2 Ashcroft Cohen Biden Kerrey Exon-2 Craig Bingaman Faircloth-2 Feinstein-2 Bennett Bumpers Kerry Mikulski-Bond Dole Kohl Gramm-2 Heflin Boxer Specter-2 Sarbanes-2 Brown Inouye Grams Bradley Lautenberg Burns Johnston Grassley Bryan Leahy Campbell Moynihan Gregg Byrd Levin Hatfield Chafee Nunn Conrad Lieberman Cochran Pryor Jeffords Dodd Moseley-Braun Coverdell Kassebaum Dorgan Murray DeWine Kempthorne Feingold Pell Frist Reid Lugar Ford Nickles Gorton Glenn Robb Hatch Packwood Graham Rockefeller Helms Pressler Harkin Simon Hutchison Roth Hollings Wellstone EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: Inhofe Santorum Kyl Smith 1—Official Buisiness Lott Snowe 2—Necessarily Absent Mack Thomas 3—Illness McCain Thompson 4—Other McConnell Murkowski SYMBOLS: Shelby AY—Announced Yea Simpson Stevens AN-Announced Nav PY-Paired Yea Thurmond PN-Paired Nay Warner

VOTE NO. 439 SEPTEMBER 18, 1995

million in losses. It is one of the worst disasters that the cotton industry has ever had. If we do not approve this \$41 million many farmers will go out of business.

Our colleagues tell us that the farmers have brought it on themselves by not understanding how the new crop insurance program passed last year works. However, most farmers were simply told that for a \$50 fee they would receive the same benefits as the Federal Government had given in the past on an ad hoc basis (when it deemed benefits to be justified). Farmers were delighted by this change--they thought they would receive needed protection without the vagaries of political calculation keeping them constantly guessing as to whether the Federal Government would decide that a given disaster was great enough to justify sending aid. Now that a disaster has occurred, though, cotton farmers have found out that what sounded too good to be true was indeed too good to be true. The new program does not provide the same amount of disaster aid as has been traditionally provided; it provides substantially less. The entire cotton industry is threatened now because farmers misunderstood how the new crop insurance program works. We should not deny help based on a misunderstanding. We assure our colleagues that we will not regularly support disaster assistance payments--this case is unique. We think cotton farmers deserve this extra assistance, and accordingly urge the tabling of the amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

Congress passed the Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act last year, with the intention of putting an end to ad hoc disaster assistance payments. This bill, nevertheless, contains a proposal for such ad hoc payments to cotton farmers. Our colleagues tell us that we need to make these payments because cotton farmers will not receive enough for their losses from the new crop insurance program. If they will not receive enough, though, it is their own fault. How much insurance they have was determined by them. They were all required to buy a bare minimum amount of insurance. The benefits provided by that insurance are very straightforward--it requires a pretty substantial stretch of the imagination to believe anyone could possibly have misunderstood them. The Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act clearly states that catastrophic coverage will only cover 50 percent loss in yield on an individual yield or area yield basis, indemnified at 60 percent of the expected market price. Any farmer who thought that this minimum amount of insurance, which was never intended to provide full coverage against disasters, was insufficient, could have bought additional crop insurance at a subsidized rate. The purpose of the Act we passed last year was to plan responsibly for crop disasters before they occur. This proposal to give funding to cotton farmers is the first attempt to bypass that Act. If it is approved, Senators are going to see one farm group after another, year in and year out, coming to them asking for additional assistance. We should not give in. If farmers need more insurance than they should buy it. If Senators do not think that the minimum required amount is high enough they should raise it. However, especially considering that this bill is making extreme cuts in numerous other agricultural programs, we are not about to give this extra aid. We accordingly urge our colleagues to oppose the motion to table this amendment.